ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA609651 06/12/2014

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92056574
Party	Defendant El Group, LLC
Correspondence Address	JAMES C DUDA BULKEY RICHARDSON & GELINAS LLP 1500 MAIN STREET, SUITE 2700 SPRINGFIELD, MA 01115 5060 UNITED STATES jduda@bulkley.com, tm@bulkley.com, rfederici@bulkley.com
Submission	Reply in Support of Motion
Filer's Name	James C. Duda
Filer's e-mail	jduda@bulkley.com, jmiller@bulkley.com, cvincent@bulkley.com
Signature	/James C. Duda/
Date	06/12/2014
Attachments	Registrant EL Group, LLC's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Cross-Motion to Dismiss.pdf(152087 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

In re Registration of EL GROUP, LLC d/b/a Lotuff & Clegg
Registration No. : 3,872,561
Registration Date : November 9, 2010

Mark : LOTUFF & CLEGG

Cancellation No. : 92056574

FRANK CLEGG LEATHERWORKS, LLC,

Petitioner,

V.

EL GROUP, LLC d/b/a LOTUFF & CLEGG, Registrant.

REGISTRANT EL GROUP, LLC'S REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS CROSS-MOTION TO DISMISS CANCELLATION PROCEEDING

Registrant EL Group, LLC ("Registrant"), by its attorneys, submits the following Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Cross-Motion to Dismiss Cancellation Proceeding ("Motion") to briefly address inaccurate and erroneous assertions made by Petitioner Frank Clegg Leatherworks, LLC's ("Petitioner") in its opposition to the Motion ("Opposition" or "Opp.").

First, while Petitioner claims that it was improper for Registrant to file the Motion (Opp. 3-5), Petitioner does not set forth any valid reason why the Motion should not be granted. Petitioner concedes that "all of the issues" in this cancellation proceeding will be decided in the current court action between the parties. (Opp. 4.) It is precisely on this basis that Registrant seeks dismissal of this cancellation proceeding. Simply, all parties agree that this cancellation

proceeding, which has already been pending for 18 months, has been rendered moot by the court action. (Motion 6-7.)

Second, having no valid basis to oppose the Motion, Petitioner makes spurious and outright bizarre claims as to Registrant's motivation in filing it; specifically, that Registrant, by seeking to terminate a needless and expensive administrative proceeding, that all parties agree is moot, is somehow attempting to harm Petitioner's reputation or "drain Petitioner's resources." (Opp. 2, 6.) Registrant is unaware of a single instance in which wholly undocumented paranoid about the reputational consequences of a dismissal has served as the basis for prolonging any type of judicial or administrative proceeding. There is absolutely no support for Petitioner's charges regarding Petitioner's motivation, which are false and should be disregarded by the Board.

Third, contrary to Petitioner's assertions (Opp. 4-5), Registrant does not argue in the Motion – nor has it ever argued – that this case should be dismissed because earlier settlement discussions were unsuccessful. Rather, Petitioner fabricates this argument based upon what Registrant can only surmise is Registrant's reference to the settlement discussions in the fact section of its Motion. (Motion 2.) Registrant only mentions the settlement discussions in the context of the entire history of these proceedings, which Registrant set forth in the Motion to support its argument that Petitioner has failed to actively prosecute its claims since it initiated these proceedings on December 12, 2012. (Motion 7-8.)

Finally, in the Motion, Registrant takes the position that, however the Motion is decided, the issues between the Parties should only be litigated once, in the court action. (Motion 8, 9.)

To that end, Registrant states: "In the event the Board determines that dismissal of the Amended Petition for Cancellation is unwarranted, Registrant respectfully requests that the Board suspend these proceedings until the issues before it are determined in the State Court Action." (Motion 9 (emphasis added).) In the Opposition, however, Petitioner blatantly misquotes this statement by omitting the emphasized portion above and citing the remainder of the statement and arguing that Registrant's position "undercut[s]" its motion for dismissal. (Opp. 4.) Such backhanded and intentionally misleading tactics should not be tolerated.

The bottom line is that Petitioner provides no basis for why Registrant's Motion should not be granted. It is well settled law that, in general, a case becomes moot, and therefore, nonjusticiable as involving no case or controversy, "when the issues presented are no longer 'live'" U.S. Parole Commission v. Geraghty, 445 U.S. 388, 396 (1980) (quoting Powell v. McCormack, 395 U.S. 486, 496 (1969)). Because all parties agree that all issues relevant to the cancellation proceeding will be decided in the court action, there is no "live" issue for this Board to consider.

Thus, for the reasons set forth above and in Registrant El Group, LLC's Cross-Motion to Dismiss Cancellation Proceedings, Registrant respectfully requests that the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board grant Registrant's Motion to Dismiss Petitioner's Amended Petition for Cancellation and dismiss Petitioner's Amended Petition for Cancellation. In the event that the Board determines that dismissal of the Amended Petition for Cancellation is unwarranted, Registrant respectfully requests that the Board suspend these proceedings until the issues before it are determined in the court action.

EL GROUP, LLC, By its Attorneys,

/s/ James C. Duda

James C. Duda, Esq.
BULKLEY, RICHARDSON AND GELINAS, LLP
1500 Main Street, Suite 2700
Springfield, MA 01115

Tel.: (413) 781-2820 Fax: (413) 272-6806

Email: jduda@bulkley.com

Dated: June 12, 2014

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon counsel for Petitioner by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, on the 12th day of June, 2014.

/s/ James C. Duda	
James C. Duda	

1785773v1